

Attorney Docket No.: 201440-9001**REMARKS**

Claims 1, and 4-6 have been amended, and claims 7-11 have been added. The specification has been amended to correct minor typographical and other errors. No new matter has been added. Therefore, claims 1- 11 remain pending for prosecution.

**Objection to Claim 4**

The Examiner has objected to claim 4 because the phrase "opposite said radio unit" appears to be "opposite to said radio unit." Claim 4 has been amended to replace "opposite said radio unit" to --opposite to said radio unit--. It is, therefore, respectfully requested that the objection to claims 19-23 be withdrawn.

**Rejection of Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Examiner has rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,828,339 ("Patel"). Claim 6 has been amended to recite that the reflecting plane "includes a reflector connected with a grounding pattern on the printed circuit board."

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claims is found, either expressly or inherently in a single prior art reference." MPEP §2131; Verdegall Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

The Examiner has failed to set forth a prima facie case of anticipation because he has failed to show that Patel teaches all the limitations of claim 6. Patel fails to teach an internal antenna of a portable communication unit, and a reflecting plane that "includes a reflector connected with a grounding pattern on the printed circuit board."

Patel teaches a wireless telecommunication system (Patel, Fig. 1) that is based on providing fixed microwave links between subscriber terminals 20 at fixed locations within a service area and a central terminal 10. (Patel, col. 4, lines 42-45). The subscriber terminal 20 includes a customer radio unit (CRU) 24 that is mounted on the customer's premises. (Patel, col.

Attorney Docket No.: 201440-9001

4, lines 55-56; Fig. 2; the CRU is shown in more detail in Figs. 9-12). The CRU 24 includes a flat panel antenna 23 and is mounted so that the antenna 23 faces in the direction 26 of the central terminal 10. (Patel, col. 4, lines 55-62; Fig. 12).

Because the CRU, which includes antenna 23, is mounted on a customer's premises, the antenna 23 is not part of a portable communication unit as recited in claim 6. In addition, Patel does not teach an antenna metal element connected with a radiator and brought into contact with a feeding terminal on a printed circuit board, also recited in claim 6. In Patel, the metalized wall 217 (metalized antenna element) does not contact radiator 220, nor does it contact the RF board 228 at all (Patel, Figs. 11-12). In fact, as shown in Fig. 12, the radiator 220 and the RF circuit board 228 are separated by the RF circuitry 230. Therefore, Patel fails to all the limitations of claim 6. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 6 be withdrawn.

#### Rejection of Claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being obvious over US Patent No. 6,169,521 ("Kitamura") in view of US Patent No. 5,952,975 ("Pedersen").

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness because he has failed to show that the cited references teach every limitation of the rejected claims. "To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, ... the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." M.P.E.P. § 2142 citing *In re Vaack*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

The Examiner has failed to set forth a *prima facie* case of obviousness because he has failed to show that Kitamura in view of Pedersen teach all the limitations of claims 1-4. Patel fails to teach "a reflector connected with a grounding pattern on the printed circuit board."

Kitamura teaches mounting an antenna in a case for a portable radio device. (Kitamura, col. 1, lines 4-5). Kitamura does not teach, nor does it even mention a reflector. Further, Kitamura also does discuss a grounding portion of a printed circuit board. Thus, Kitamura cannot teach a "reflector connected with a grounding pattern on the printed circuit board." In addition, this limitation is not found in Pedersen. Therefore, Kitamura combined with Pedersen as suggested by the Examiner does not teach all the limitations of claims 1-4. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-4 be withdrawn.

Attorney Docket No.: 201440-9001**Rejection of Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner has rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being obvious over Patel, in view of Kitamura, further in view of Pedersen.

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness because, as discussed above in connection with claims 1 and 6, these references do not teach all the limitations recited in claim 5. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 5 be withdrawn.

**New Claims 7-11**


It is respectfully asserted that new claims 7-11 are distinguishable over the references cited by the Examiner and as combined by the Examiner for the reasons set forth above.

Attorney Docket No.: 201440-9001**Conclusion**

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth in this Amendment and Response to Office Action, it is respectfully submitted that the Pending Application, including claims 1-11, is in condition for allowance. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the foregoing amendments be entered, and the Pending Application be promptly allowed.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned if such contact would in any way facilitate and expedite the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 24, 2005  
Susan D. Reinecke 40,198  
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP  
401 North Michigan Avenue  
Suite 1900  
Chicago, Illinois 60611  
(312) 222-0800